

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-11, 13-16 and 18-24 are pending in the application, with 1, 15 and 18 being the independent claim. Claim 12 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 9, 13-15, and 18 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 5,264,958) in view of Applicants' Previously Submitted Art (hereinafter "APSA") as indicated in the Background Art section of the Applicants' specification. Claims 3-16 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of APSA and further in view of Oprescu et. al. ("Oprescu") (U.S. Patent No. 5,559,967).

As asserted in response to the previous office action, the Applicants maintain that APSA and Johnson are non-analogous art. Further, Applicants argue that, for instance, although claims 9-14 were rejected based on Johnson in view of APSA and further in view of Oprescu, the references alone or in combination do not teach or suggest a receiver section comprising a clock recovery system, a deserializer, a comma

detect and alignment device, and a signal detect device as previously recited in claim 12 (now cancelled).

The independent claims, claims 1, 15 and 18, have been amended to incorporate the features of a receiver section comprising a clock recovery system, a deserializer, a comma detect and alignment device, and a signal detect device. As recognized by the Examiner (Office Action, p. 6), Johnson and APSA, alone or in combination do not disclose this set of features. In addition, Johnson and APSA further in view of Oprescu do not disclose this set of features. Oprescu teaches a method and apparatus of transmitting speed messages independent of the data signal transfer on a multi-speed bus, and does not teach the features of a receiver section comprising a clock recovery system, a deserializer, a comma detect and alignment device, and a signal detect device.

Because Johnson, APSA and Oprescu, considered alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 15 and 18 as amended, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider and withdraw the rejections. Also, at least based on their dependencies and further in view of their own features, Claims 2-11, 13-14, 16, 18-24 should be found allowable over the applied references.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: November 21, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

694539_1.DOC